

S/N 10/585,295

In response to the Office Action dated March 23, 2010

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of allowable claim 2. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 3 has been amended editorially. No new matter is added.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 12-19 are considered allowable if rewritten in independent form. Allowable claim 2 has been canceled and has been included in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable and claims 3, 6, 7 12-19 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 1 or intervening dependent claims.

Claims 4 and 5 are allowed.

### 35 USC § 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 8-10, 20 and 23 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. (US 6,471,839). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of allowable claim 2 and is therefore allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 8-10, 20 and 23 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 1 or intervening dependent claims. The rejections of these dependent claims should be withdrawn. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

### 35 USC § 103 Rejections

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 6,471,839) in view of Charlton et al. (US 5,798,031). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

S/N 10/585,295

In response to the Office Action dated March 23, 2010

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 6,471,839) in view of Nagakawa et al. (US 7,390,391). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 20-22 and 24 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 1 or intervening dependent claims. The rejections of these dependent claims should be withdrawn. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.



Dated: June 10, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM/lif